

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03311 112326Z

66

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 USIA-12 TRSE-00 MBFR-03

SAJ-01 IO-13 OIC-04 DODE-00 H-02 NSC-10 SS-15 OMB-01

ACDA-19 AEC-11 RSR-01 /153 W
----- 057517

R 111750Z JUL 73

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 0000

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 3119

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 3311

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: JULY 11 NAC DISCUSSION OF WORKING GROUP ACTIVITIES

REF: STATE 134963 NOTAL

SUMMARY: COUNCIL AGREED THAT MBFR WORKING GROUP SHOULD CONTINUE TECHNICAL STUDIES IN RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC TASKS REQUESTED BY NAC, BUT COMPLETED WORKING GROUP STUDIES SHOULD NOT BE PREREQUISITE TO COUNCIL DISCUSSION OF OR DECISION ON ISSUES FOR NEGOTIATIONS. COUNCIL ASKED WORKING GROUP TO PURSUE AGREED MBFR DATA BASE, IN ACCORDANCE WITH PREVIOUSLY AGREED MANDATE, AND TO EXPEDITE ANALYSES OF CONVENTIONAL TACTICAL AIR BALANCE IN CENTRAL EUROPE. WG SHOULD ALSO STUDY DEGREE OF EARLY WARNING THAT MIGHT BE DERIVED FROM MBFR AGREEMENTS, AND COULD DISCUSS MILITARY ANALYSES OF REDUCTION OPTIONS IN U.S. APRIL 30 PAPER BEING PREPARED BY SACEUR. TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF CONSTRAINTS AND NON-CIRCUMVENTION IN CENTRAL EUROPE, AND OF VERIFICATION MEASURES FOR SPECIFIC REDUCTION OPTIONS, COULD BE UNDERTAKEN AFTER RPT AFTER DECISIONS ON THESE MATTERS HAD BEEN TAKEN BY NAC. END SUMMARY
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 03311 112326Z

1. SYG RECALLED THAT A NUMBER OF PERMREPS HAD EXPRESSED SUPPORT FOR MAINTAINING WORKING GROUP AT JULY 5 NAC (USNATO 3232). UK AND CANADA HAD HAD SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS FOR WG ACTIVITIES, AS HAD MC CHAIRMAN IN LETTER CIRCULATED AFTER NAC (USNATO 3275).

WERE THERE ANY ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS FOR WG UNDERTAKINGS?

2. BOSS (FRG) ON INSTRUCTIONS SAID NAC SHOULD MAKE BETTER USE OF WORKING GROUP AND GIVE IT PRECISE MANDATES IN CONNECTION WITH DEVELOPMENT OF AGREED ALLIED NEGOTIATING PROGRAM. BOSS SUGGESTED FOLLOWING UNDERTAKINGS IN ORDER OF PRIORITY:

A. DEVELOPMENT OF COMMON DATA BASE;

B. CONTINUATION OF CURRENT CONSTRAINTS WORK AND AN ADDITIONAL ANALYSES OF EFFECT OF POSSIBLE CONSTRAINTS ON "BIG LIFT" RE-INFORCEMENTS;

C. TECHNICAL ANALYSES OF SEPARATE REDUCTION STEPS (I.E., PHASES) AS MIGHT BE ENVISAGED BY NAC; AND

D. TECHNICAL ANALYSES OF VERIFICATION MEASURES IN CONNECTION WITH THESE REDUCTION STEPS, ONCE "STEPS" THEMSELVES WERE AGREED UPON.

3. MCAULIFFE (US) DREW ON REFTTEL AND MADE ADDITIONAL POINTS:

A. THAT CANADIAN PROPOSAL FOR A STUDY OF VERIFICATION PROCEDURES SEEMED PREMATURE, IF SUCH A STUDY WERE INTENDED TO GO BEYOND THE EXTENSIVE ANALYTICAL WORK ON VERIFICATION ALREADY DONE IN NATO FRAMEWORK; AND

B. THAT US APRIL 30 PAPER SHOULD BE USED BY WORKING GROUP AS BACKGROUND FOR STUDIES, AND WORKING GROUP COULD DISCUSS SACEUR'S MILITARY ANALYSES OF THE US OPTIONS, BUT NO ADDITIONAL ACTION BY THE WG ON THE US PAPER SEEMED CALLED FOR.

4. GREEK AND ITALIAN PERMREPS SAID THEY SAW LITTLE CAUSE FOR US CONCERN THAT MBFR WG COULD OR WOULD IMPEDE NAC DECISIONS, BUT CONCURRED THAT WG SHOULD NOT RPT NOT DEAL WITH FORM MBFR OF AGREEMENTS.

5. DE STAERCKE (BELGIUM) SAID THAT PURPOSE OF WORKING GROUP SHOULD CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 03311 112326Z

BE SEEN AS MEANS TO CREATE POLITICAL CONFIDENCE THROUGH TECHNICAL STUDIES IN A MULTILATERAL FRAMEWORK. HE ASKED WHY US WAS EVIDENTLY ATTEMPTING TO BLOC FURTHER WORK BY VERIFICATION SUB-GROUP BY OPPOSING CANADIAN SUGGESTION. (MCCCHAIRMAN STEINHOFF LATER MADE SAME POINT.)

6. SPIERENBURG (NETHERLANDS) SAID HE THOUGHT ALLIES WERE QUITE CLOSE TO AGREEMENT ON DEFINING ROLE FOR WG, AFTER LISTENING TO MCAULIFFE'S STATEMENT, AND THOUGHT SYG COULD PROBABLY SUM UP DISCUSSIONS IN A WAY THAT WOULD SATISFY ALL. THE NETHERLANDS CERTAINLY CONCURRED WITH US THAT WG SHOULD NOT UNDERTAKE NEW STUDIES WITHOUT NAC GUIDANCE.

7. MCAULIFFE CONCURRED THAT ALLIES WERE SUBSTANTIALLY AGREED,

AND REPLIED TO DE STAERCKE THAT COUNCIL AND SENIOR POLADS WERE NO LESS "MULTILATERAL" THAN MBFR WG. WITH REFERENCE TO TASKS OF VERIFICATION SUBGROUP, US VIEW WAS SIMPLY THAT WORK WOULD NOT BE USEFUL WITHOUT FURTHER POLITICAL DECISIONS ABOUT WHAT WAS TO BE VERIFIED.

8. SUMMING UP DISCUSSION SYG SAID THAT COUNCIL CONSENSUS APPEARED TO BE THAT MBFR WG SHOULD CONTINUE TO PERFORM STUDIES IN THE "TECHNICAL PROVINCE" AS REQUIRED BY AND IN RESPONSE TO TASKS LEVIED BY NAC, BUT COMPLETED STUDIES BY WG SHOULD NOT BE SET AS A PREREQUISITE FOR COUNCIL DISCUSSION OF AND DECISION ON MBFR ISSUES FOR NEGOTIATIONS. WG SHOULD CONTINUE ITS WORK ON DATA, TACTICAL AIR AND CONSTRAINTS. MORE SPECIFICALLY, IT SHOULD CONSIDER TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF CONSTRAINTS AND NON-CIRCUMVENTION IN CENTRAL EUROPE, ONCE DECISIONS ON THESE TOPICS HAD BEEN TAKEN BY COUNCIL. SIMILARLY WG SHOULD REVIEW VERIFICATION MEASURES FOR SPECIFIC REDUCTIONS SUBJECT TO COUNCIL DECISIONS ON THESE REDUCTION OPTIONS. IN WORK ON NATO AND WARSAW PACT DATA BASE, WG SHOULD GIVE CONSIDERATION TO APPARENT DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN US FORCE DATA IN "US APPROACH TO MBFR" AND OTHER NATO DATA. WG SHOULD PURSUE UK SUGGESTION TO STUDY DEGREE OF EARLY WARNING THAT MIGHT BE ACHIEVED THROUGH MBFR AGREEMENTS. IS SHOULD REVIEW MILITARY ANALYSES OF US REDUCTION OPTIONS. FINALLY, WG SHOULD CONTINUE STUDY OF AIR POSITION IN CENTRAL EUROPE AND, EVENTUALLY, ITS RELATIONSHIP TO GROUND FORCE REDUCTIONS.

9. SYG'S SUMMING UP WAS ACCEPTED BY NAC WITHOUT COMMENT AND WILL
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 03311 112326Z

BE RECORDED IN COUNCIL RECORD. MCAULIFFE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 02 APR 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 11 JUL 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: boyleja
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973NATO03311
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730767/abqcebdi.tel
Line Count: 143
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: STATE 134963 NOTAL
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: boyleja
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 13 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <13-Aug-2001 by kellerpr>; APPROVED <20-Sep-2001 by boyleja>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: JULY 11 NAC DISCUSSION OF WORKING GROUP ACTIVITIES
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005